RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 0 5 2008

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-8, 16, 18, 19, 21, 28-33, 39, 41, and 42, are pending.

Telephone Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, Matthew C. Sams, and his supervisor, Lester Kincaid, for granting and attending the telephone interview, with Applicants' Representatives, Caleb Pollack, Reg. No. 37,912, and Yamima Eadan, and Moshe Vegh, a representative of the assignee, on January 16, 2008. During the interview, independent Claim 1, as a representative claim, and the rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuan, US Pub. App. 2003/0224797, were discussed. Applicants' representatives gave reasons for allowing Claim 1.

No agreement was reached, but the Examiners agreed to consider Applicants' arguments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 16, 28, and 39, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Kuan et al. (US Pub. App. 2003/0224797, "Kuan") and Claims 3-8, 18, 19, 21, 29-33, 41, and 42, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Kuan in view of Choi (US Pat. No. 6,967,944, "Choi").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 1, 3-8, 16, 18, 19, 21, 28-33, 39, 41, and 42 under U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 1 and 39 each include, *inter alia*:

> receiving a nodes report from each of a plurality of reporting nodes of the wireless communication system wherein a nodes report includes node communication related parameters of other nodes of the wireless communication system which are measured by a reporting node.

Claim 16 includes, *inter alia*:

> a receiver to receive a nodes report from each of a plurality of reporting nodes of the wireless communication system, wherein a nodes report includes one or more node communication related parameters of other nodes of the wireless communication system which are measured by a reporting node

Claim 28 includes, *inter alia*:

> a note to generate a nodes report of a plurality of other nodes of the wireless communication system wherein the nodes report includes one or more communication related parameters of said plurality of nodes

Kuan does not teach at least these features. Kuan teaches a single detector monitoring transmissions in a network (e.g., see Abstract and Figs. 4, 6, and 7 of Kuan). Since Kuan monitors transmissions for an access point using only a detector, which inherently has a predetermined reception range, transmissions from outside of that predetermined range (e.g., transmitted by a hidden node) cannot be detected by this monitoring. Thus, Kuan's system does not have the capability to detect hidden nodes. In contrast, Applicants' Claim 1 foe example includes, receiving node communication related parameters measured by each of a plurality of reporting nodes. Thus, transmissions outside of the reception range of e.g. an access point, such as those transmitted by a hidden node, but within the reception range of at least one of the reporting nodes may be measured and reported to e.g. the access point. Thus, the reporting nodes may reveal to an access point a hidden node.

Claim 1 for example includes, *inter alia*, "receiving a nodes report ... [including] node communication related parameters of ... other nodes ... which are measured by a reporting node". The network transmissions monitored in the system of Kuan, described on page 2 paragraph [0030] of Kuan, referenced by the Examiner, do not include node

communication related parameters of *other* nodes and are not measured by a separate reporting node. Nowhere does Kuan teach a report the features of Applicants' claims.

Claim 1 for example includes, *inter alia*, "detecting a hidden node". Nowhere does Kuan mention detecting a hidden node, and Kuan's system is not capable of detecting a hidden node.

Claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, "broadcasting a first command to the plurality of nodes to start a hidden node detection [and] broadcasting a second command to the plurality of nodes to send a nodes report to the access point". On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that these features of Claim 1 are not explicitly recited in Kuan, but are obvious from Kuan's teachings on page 6 paragraph [0089], which states that "the detector can be used by a user as a diagnostic tool, by an administrator as an administrative tool".

Applicants respectfully disagree. Since Kuan's detector already monitors transmissions without a command, there is no motivation for the user or administrator to broadcast such a command. Furthermore, Kuan teaches away from these limitations in the preceding paragraph [0088] on page 6, which states, "the detector scans the channels, it passively receives the transmissions, meaning that it does not broadcast signals on the WLAN." (emphasis added.) Kuan includes no specific recitation of, includes no motivation for, and includes a teaching away from, these limitations of claim 1.

Examples of benefits of some features of embodiments of Applicants claims over Kuan are provided for illustrative purposes. These benefits are meant to be non-limiting and apply to certain embodiments. For example, in one embodiment of the invention of Claim 1, since a plurality of nodes are used to measure node parameters, the computational burden for each node is potentially reduced as compared to that of Kuan, which teaches a single detector carrying the sole burden of monitoring all network transmissions (e.g., see Abstract and Figs. 4, 6, and 7 of Kuan). In another embodiment of the invention of Claim 1, the range of coverage for measuring is variable (e.g., the collective reception ranges of the transitive group of reporting nodes in a wireless network). In contrast, Kuan's range of coverage for monitoring (the reception range of the detector) is inherently predetermined or fixed. If a sufficient number of reporting nodes having a sufficient reception range are used, the range of coverage for measuring (the

collective reception ranges of the nodes) is potentially larger than the predetermined range of coverage of Kuan. Additional or other benefits of Applicants' claims may be realized.

Applicants' submit that Claims 1, 16, 28, and 39, are allowable over Kuan. The Addition of Choi does not cure the deficiencies of Kuan. Each of dependent Claims 3-8, 18, 19, 21, 29-33, 41, and 42, depends directly or indirectly from, and includes all the limitations of, one of Claims 1, 16, 28, and 39. Therefore, Claims 3-8, 18, 19, 21, 29-33, 41, and 42, are likewise allowable

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 3-8, 16, 18, 19, 21, 28-33, 39, 41, and 42 under 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

No fees are believed to be due associated with this paper. However, if any fees are due, please charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

Caleb Pollack
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,912

Dated: March 5, 2008

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801